

**REMARKS**

Claims 1-5, 15-19, 21, 59 and 63 are amended. Claims 1-21 and 58-65 are in the application for consideration.


With respect to claim 1 and the "location" referred to therein, the Examiner during the interview was questioning whether such might be construed to include/encompass a location which was within the chamber and accordingly might be at a deposition temperature in excess of 170°C thereby perhaps reading upon all prior art injection of ozone into a deposition chamber at deposition temperature. The undersigned believes the language as initially presented was clear and not so encompassing, and nevertheless agreed to add "immediately before" the word "location" in the manner claim 1 is amended herein, and as suggested by the Examiner. With such, the Examiner indicated he would likely withdraw his rejections of claim 1 over Metzner et al. Corresponding amendments are made herein as respects "location" in the other claims.

The undersigned during the interview also asserted the arguments presented in his last filed response pertaining to the inapplicability of Davis et al. The Examiner generally concurred with such assertions, subject to further consideration, and indicated likely withdrawal of the rejection over Davis et al. upon the filing of the amendment to claim 1 herein.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 11-22-05

By:



Mark S. Matkin  
Reg. No. 32,268